



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

gress in a multitude of instances, and it is our most earnest desire to labour diligently to promote it, and to obtain the co-operation of all who have it at heart like ourselves.

OUR attention has been called to a letter in the *Freeman's Journal*, from the Rev. R. C. Kelsh, who appears to be a Roman Catholic clergyman, in the diocese of Meath. Part of the letter is as follows:—

"DEAR SIR,—will you allow me the favour of complaining through your paper, of a gross outrage practised of late on my Catholic friends in this neighbourhood, in the repeated transmission to them through the Post-office, of publications highly offensive to their religious feelings. I need scarcely say, that I allude particularly to the *CATHOLIC LAYMAN*. It is idle for these mistaken men to imagine that they will gain converts to their cause, from our intellectual, upright, and religious people, by their foul, filthy effusions."

Mr. Kelsh also accuses us of "unnecessary insult!" We think our readers will scarcely sympathize either with Mr. KELSH's epithets or irritation.

If Mr. Kelsh would write to ourselves, and explain to us what "outrage" we have committed, or what "insult" we have offered, or wherein we have been "filthy," he would do us a kindness.

If we have, in any point, mistaken the doctrine of the Church of Rome, our pages are at Mr. Kelsh's service to correct our mistake. If we have advanced arguments that can be shown to be unsound, our pages are at his service to show it. We tell him that our paper is read by a vast number of Roman Catholics. If he thinks they have been set wrong by what they read in our pages, we offer him the same opportunity of setting them right; would not this be the most likely way of accomplishing the object?

Correspondence.

ON PURGATORY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR.—Before I undertake the discussion of any other subject, permit me to offer a few words in reply to your remarks on the second part of my letter, published in the *CATHOLIC LAYMAN*, of December, 1852. The only point to which I wish to direct attention, is the extract from Origen, which I quoted in support of the doctrine of purgatory, and which, in my opinion, has not been, in the slightest degree, rendered nugatory by the fact, that some of the writings of this great man have been justly condemned by the Church. I am not aware that the homily from which I quoted has ever been condemned by any Council, Pope, or other legitimate authority, and when I shall have been informed that such has been the case, I will most willingly give up *Origen*; but till I shall be furnished with this information, I will hold the doctrine set forth in the extract, as the doctrine of the Catholic Church in the third century; particularly, as I find this same doctrine unequivocally set forth and supported by the concurrent testimony of other distinguished Fathers, who, if not contemporary, were immediately subsequent to Origen.

St. Epiphanius, who wrote about the year 368, expresses his admiration of the rite which directs the names of the dead to be mentioned in our prayers, and says—"the prayers which are offered for the dead, are profitable to them, though they may not blot out all their sins." Again, he says—"We make mention, both of the saints and of sinners; of sinners that we may supplicate God for mercy on them, but of the saints, both Fathers, Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Evangelists, &c., that we may honour the Lord Jesus Christ in a particular manner."—Epiphanius, *Haer.* 75, sec. 7, T. i., page 911.

He further maintains, in sec. 8, page 912, "that the Church has this doctrine traditionally from Christ."

St. Augustine, who was ordained priest, in 390, inculcates the same doctrine. He first proves from (Matt. xii. 32), that some sins may be forgiven in the world to come, for, "otherwise," says he, "it would not have been truly said of some, that their sins would neither be forgiven in this world, nor in the world to come, unless some sins, though not remitted in this world, were remitted in the world to come"—Aug. *Lib.* 21, de *Civit. Dei*, cap. 24.

He next says—"When sacrifices of the altar, or alms, are offered for all the faithful departed, for the truly good they are acts of thanksgiving; for those not very bad, they are propitiations; for those very bad, although

they afford no helps to the dead, they are, in some sort, a consolation to the living. But to those to whom they are profitable, they are either a full remission, or by them their punishment is rendered more tolerable"—*Enchiridion*, cap. 109, 110.

I might produce many other respectable witnesses from the fourth century, but the two I have produced are, I think, beyond exception; and from the quotations I have given, it is manifest, first, that the ancients did mention the saints, the Virgin Mary, the apostles, martyrs, &c., not to pray for them, as if they thought they needed their prayers, but to give honour to Christ, whose saints, &c., they are. Secondly. That they mentioned all those departed in the Christian and Catholic faith, entreating God to have mercy on them, through the saints, &c., whom they named along with them; and hence it is plain they offered these prayers, believing in a middle state of purgation or suffering of the souls of penitent Christians. "This tradition of the Fathers the universal church observes," says St. Augustine, *Serm. 172, de Verb. apos. sec. 2.*

In these discussions I cannot be persuaded that any party can claim an exclusive privilege, excepting so far as he may be entitled to such, either by the validity of his arguments, or the character of his testimonies; nor do I imagine, from my connection with your paper, that such would be attempted. Upon this principle then, I claim the right of quoting, in support of my views, from Origen's comment on Jeremiah, a right too which I consider I am as fully entitled, as you could be, when you quoted from the same comment, in page 110, col. 3, October, 1852.

I remain, Sir, yours sincerely,
EDMOND POWER.

Mullinavat, April 4th, 1853.

The first thing we have here to do is to defend ourselves from the charge of inconsistency in quoting Origen ourselves, and yet rejecting his authority when he was brought forward as a witness by Mr. Power; and our defence consists in simple explanation of the principles on which we appeal to the testimony of the Fathers. We do not believe that we are bound to assent to everything that is contained in any work of an ancient Father, even though that work be not condemned by any Pope or Council. When we quote Origen we do so merely to ascertain what were the sentiments of Origen on such a subject; but, then, there is a further question—Were the sentiments of Origen approved of by the Catholic Church of his day—that is to say, by the majority of Christians of his time? And, again, there is an appeal from their doctrine to that of their predecessors, and, above all, to the statements of our Lord himself and of his apostles. We did quote Origen's testimony to the sufficiency of Scripture; but, then, we gave quotations enough from other Fathers to show that this, at least, was not one of Origen's heresies; and we do not think Mr. Power will say that this is a subject on which Origen's views were ever held heretical. We objected to Origen's testimony in favour of Purgatory—not on account of erroneous views of his on irrelevant subjects, but because it was on this very subject of the state of the soul after death that Origen was decidedly and particularly heretical, and because the passage quoted by Mr. Power is acknowledged, by learned Roman Catholics, to be one embodying Origen's heretical views. In fact, Origen believed that all future torments were only purgatorial and temporary; and, in the excess of his charity, he supposed that even the devil himself, after a sufficient amount of suffering, would be purified enough to resume his place among the angels of God. It is easy, then, to produce passages, in which Origen speaks of the sufferings to be endured by sinners after death as temporary; but it will be seen that this is very different from the Roman Catholic doctrine of a Purgatory where torments are endured by the souls of the justified after their departure from this world.

In proof of our assertion, that the passage quoted by Mr. Power from Origen is heretical, we need only refer to the note of the Benedictine editors on the passage—viz., "Not only in this place, but in a multitude of others, Origen establishes a Purgatory; but in his own way—that is to say, that no other fire or punishments torture souls but those that are Purgatorial or temporary."—Vol. iii., p. 232. We suppose we shall not be asked for formal proof that this doctrine is heretical, but the reader who requires the authority of Popes and Councils will bear in mind that Origen was condemned by the Synods of Alexandria and of Cyprus, by Pope Anastasius, and by the fifth General Council held at Constantinople in the Pontificate of Pope Vigilius.

And as to what the Fathers taught, as to this particular doctrine of the purifying influence of the torments of another world, will best appear from the evidence of Epiphanius and Augustine, which we select from that of other Fathers, that it may be seen how Mr. Power's three witnesses agree with each other.

St. Augustine says (*Lib. de Heres.*, c. xlvi.—Ed. Bened. t. viii., p. 10)—"What Catholic Christian, learned or unlearned, does not vehemently abhor that Purgatory of sins which Origen speaks of—namely, the doctrine that those who have finished this life in scandalous crimes, and sacrileges, and impieties, the

greatest possible—nay, that the devil himself and his angels shall, after a very long time indeed, be purged and liberated, and restored to the kingdom of God and to light. Concerning which vain impurity I have disputed diligently in the books on the city of God, against the philosophers from whom Origen learned these notions."

What Epiphanius thought of Origen may be learned from his second book on heresies, where the 64th section (a very long one) is devoted to an examination of some of the errors of Origen, and where such epithets are applied to him and his doctrines that we can guess how the good father would have shuddered could he have known in what company he would be placed by Mr. Power. At present we refer to Epiphanius's letter to John, bishop of Jerusalem* (works, vol. ii., p. 314, Paris, 1622) in which, after calling Origen the father of Arius, and the root of other heresies, he goes on—"And this, too, which he maintains, I know not whether to grieve or laugh at; for this excellent teacher, Origen, dares to teach that the Devil will again be what he was once, and will return to the same dignity, and will ascend the kingdom of heaven. O shocking! Who can be so senseless and so foolish as to believe that John the Baptist, and Peter, and John the Apostle, and Isaiah, and Jeremiah, and the rest of the prophets shall be co-heirs with the Devil in the kingdom of God?"

We think we have said enough to show that Origen's notions on the subject of Purgatorial torment cannot be safely followed. And we might now reasonably refuse to go further; for it will be remembered that our controversy with W. C. Search and Mr. Power, arose out of a discussion of the question, Did the Fathers of the first three centuries know anything about Purgatory? When every attempt has failed to produce a mention of Purgatory from any orthodox writer of the first three centuries, we may be satisfied that the doctrine of Purgatory was not received by tradition from the Apostles. It becomes, then, a matter of mere historical curiosity whether the belief in it arose in the Church in the fourth or in some succeeding century. We are content, however, to enter into this discussion as far as it relates to the fourth century, and shall prove that Purgatory was no part of the doctrine of the Church in that age. In particular we shall prove that St. Epiphanius and St. Augustine counted no such belief among their articles of faith, and we shall prove it from the very passages to which Mr. Power has referred. We have so much to say on this subject that we shall make the sentiments of St. Epiphanius and St. Augustine, about Purgatory, the subject of a separate article in our next number.

THE SEVEN SACRAMENTS.

We resume our examination of the seven sacraments of the Church of Rome, in reply to the letter of "J.B.", in our March number.

We beg to remind our readers that a sacrament can only be instituted by appointing and commanding the form and matter of the sacrament. The question whether Christ instituted a sacrament is, therefore, in fact only a question whether Christ appointed the form and matter of it—that is, the words to be said and the thing to be used.

CONFIRMATION.

Our correspondent mentions Matt. xix. 13-15, as being applied by individual Roman Catholics to prove that the sacrament of confirmation, as now held by the Church of Rome, was instituted by Christ. Those words are—"Then were little children presented to him, that he should impose hands on them and pray, and the disciples rebuked them. But Jesus said, Suffer little children, and forbid them not to come to me, for the kingdom of heaven is for such. And when he imposed hands on them, he departed from them." Our correspondent adds, "see also Acts viii. 14, 15, 16, and 17."

What, then, is the "form and matter" of the sacrament of confirmation, as now held in the Church of Rome? And do these passages of Scripture prove that Christ instituted that form and matter?

What, then, is the "matter" of the modern Roman sacrament of confirmation? The Catechism of the Council of Trent answers, "The matter of confirmation is chrism" (that is, a kind of ointment, made of olive oil and balsam). Without this "matter" the Roman sacrament cannot exist at all. Now, is there any proof, in the passages above referred to, that Christ or his apostles ever used chrism? Clearly not; and, therefore, there is no proof that Christ or his apostles ever made the sacrament at all. Protestants believe that the laying on of hands is an apostolic institution; but the Church of Rome says that it is no sacrament without the use of chrism. Is not the question about the sacrament of confirmation a question whether Christ appointed chrism? and where is the proof that he did?

This "form" of the sacrament of confirmation is stated, by the same Catechism of the Council of Trent, to consist in these words—"I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and I confirm thee with the chrism of sal-

* As we have had occasion to quote this letter, it may interest our readers to know some of the circumstances which gave occasion to it. We add them in a separate article (see page 50), not wishing to mix up two subjects in the same article.

vation, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Did Christ or his apostles use these words? If not, they made no sacrament of confirmation, according to the Church of Rome. Do the passages prove that Christ instituted these words? If not, they prove no sacrament. Many most learned Roman Catholics have confessed that Christ never appointed either the matter or form of this sacrament, as now held in their Church.

HOLY ORDERS.

Matt. x. 7—"And going, preach, saying, the kingdom of heaven is at hand." See also Acts vi. 6, and xii. 3.

These words of our Saviour express only a commission to preach the Gospel; they do not institute a sacrament.

All Roman Catholics say that our Saviour did not institute a sacrament of orders until his last supper; the above words were spoken by Him nearly two years before. These words, therefore, prove that a Divine commission to preach may be given without instituting a sacrament of orders.

The "matter" of the sacrament, according to the Council of Trent, is handing to the person ordained a chalice with consecrated wine, and a paten with consecrated bread. Is there any proof from Scripture that our Saviour appointed the paten to be so handed, as the "matter" of ordaining? We have certain proof that the clergy of the early Church were not ordained by any such form; and how, then, can we say that "matter" was instituted by Christ? If that "matter" was not used, there was no sacrament in orders, according to the Church of Rome.

The "form" of this sacrament is declared, by the Catechism of the Council of Trent, to consist in these words—"Receive the power of offering sacrifice," &c. Without these words the Church of Rome holds that the sacrament of orders cannot be made. If any one will show us proof that Christ appointed these words, to be used in conferring orders, we may then believe that he instituted the Roman sacrament of orders.

We acknowledge that Christ instituted a ministry, and gave a Divine commission, which still continues in the Church; but the Church of Rome says that this institution is no sacrament without the use of the words—"Receive the form of offering sacrifice." Without those words the sacrament cannot be. Now, it is notorious that no such words were used in ordaining for ages after Christ; we, therefore, acknowledge Holy Orders as an institution of Christ, but not as a sacrament instituted by him.

EXTREME UNCTION.

Of this we have spoken before; there is less reason to dwell on it here, which our space does not permit. The only passages even referred to for it (Matt. x. 6, and James v. 14, 15), so evidently refer to the healing of the body, and so expressly promise that healing, that we are at a loss to understand how any one can suppose that these passages could be intended to institute a sacrament which was to be understood only in case "of approaching dissolution."

ON THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—As it is possible that many members of the Church of Rome may never have read or considered the original documents in which the doctrine of their church, regarding "the sacrifice of the mass," is set forth, I have thought it desirable to put together some extracts relating to it, taken from the most authentic Roman Catholic formularies, and to subjoin some observations upon them, in order that Roman Catholics may be fully aware of the teaching of their church on this head, and of the consequences to which it leads.

1. The doctrine of the Church of Rome on the "Sacrifice of the mass," as set forth by the Council of Trent, is this:—(Vid. Catechism, by decree of the Holy Council of Trent, published by command of Pope Pius V. Rome, printed at the Propaganda Press. SUPERIORUM PERMISSU, 1839)—

"We, therefore, confess that the Sacrifice of the Mass is, and ought to be, considered, *one and the same sacrifice with that of the cross*; FOR THE VICTIM IS ONE AND THE SAME, Christ our Lord, who offered himself once only a bloody sacrifice on the altar of the cross. This being the case the pastor will teach with absolute certainty that the holy sacrifice of the mass is a TRULY PROPIETARY SACRIFICE, by which God is appeased and rendered propitious to us. If, therefore, with pure hearts, a lively faith, and an inward sorrow for our transgressions, we IMMOLATE and offer this most holy victim we shall, no doubt, obtain mercy," &c., &c. (pp. 246-7.)

Again (Council of Trent, Session xxiii., ch. 1, 2, and canon 3, also Creed of Pius IV.), the doctrine is thus authoritatively set forth—"Christ having celebrated the ancient passover, which the multitude of the children of Israel immolated in memory of their departure out of Egypt, He (Christ) instituted the new Passover, to wit, namely, that Himself should be immolated through the priests." (Vide Trident. Coun. supra.) By which one thing only can be intended to be stated, namely, that as the children of Israel "slew, immolated, destroyed" the lamb in the Passover, so, in like manner, is Christ (the host, or victim) slain, immolated, and destroyed, by the officiating priest, every time the sacrifice of the mass is offered! The doctrine, as stated in the words of the Trent Catechism, Creed, and Canons of the Council, cannot, I think, bear any other construction;

is performed in the mass, that *same Christ is contained and immolated* in a bloodless manner, who once offered himself in a bloody manner on the cross, the holy synod teaches that this sacrifice is *truly propitiatory*; for the victim is one and the same, the same now offering, by the ministry of priests, who then offered himself on the cross, the manner alone of offering being different." Therefore, saith the canon, "If any one shall say that the sacrifice of the mass is only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, but not a propitiatory sacrifice; or that it avails him only that receiveth; and that it ought not to be offered for the living and the dead for sins, satisfactions, and other necessities; let him be anathema"—accursed!

2. This is the doctrine of the Church of Rome, based (as we have seen) upon a special, and formal, and authoritative decree of that church, in synod assembled, regarding this awful subject. It follows, of course, unavoidably, upon a doctrine previously propounded, the doctrine of transubstantiation. The church had there taught by decree (Vid. Cat. of Pius V., ib. pp. 208, 214, 219, 225, 243-4: and Council Trident, Sess. xiii. ch. 4, and Can. 1, 2: and the Creed of Pius IV.), that "this is the Eucharist, that which before consecration was bread and wine, is, after consecration, really and substantially, the body and blood of our Lord;" that "it is the conversion of the bread in the true body of our Lord;" that the real body of Christ, the same that was born of the Virgin, and sits at the right hand of the Father in heaven, is contained in this sacrament; and that, however remote from, and alien to, the senses it may seem, NO SUBSTANCE OF THE ELEMENTS REMAINS IN THE SACRAMENT; the substance of bread and wine is so changed into the body and blood of our Lord, THAT THE SUBSTANCE OF BREAD AND WINE ALTOGETHER CEASES TO EXIST: "after consecration the substance of bread and wine DOES NOT REMAIN IN THE SACRAMENT;" and that, therefore, "the worship of Latra (worship of highest order), 'which is DUE TO THE TRUE GOD, is to be offered to this most holy sacrament';" and that "if any one shall deny the same, let him be anathema," or accursed!

Having decreed this as its doctrine regarding the nature of the sacrament, the offering of such a sacrament must, unavoidably, become a "sacrifice"—a sacrifice of the host ("hostia") or victim—that victim being Christ Himself.

There cannot be two opinions, then, regarding what the authoritative teaching of the Roman Church, since the Tridentine council, upon this subject is. That Church teaches, that the sacrament of the Eucharist is the sacrificing of a propitiatory victim for the sins of the living and of the dead, every time it is celebrated; that the very body and blood created by consecration of the elements—the same that was born into the world of the Virgin Mary—are then "IMMOLATED;" and that the sacrificer is the officiating Priest.

3. Now, my object in publishing this statement from the Catechism, Creed, Councils, and Canons of the Tridentine Church at Rome is, that those who are designedly kept in ignorance regarding what the very doctrines of that Church are, may accurately know the truth, and thereby be in a position to follow my arguments and observations upon them, and judge for themselves as to the unavoidable consequences to which those doctrines lead.

First, let us simply regard the terms in which this doctrine is embodied.

It is stated that the sacrament of the Eucharist is the sacrificial offering of the human body of Christ—"the same that was born of the Virgin"—"the same that was offered on the cross."—Vid. Catec., ibid. p. 205, 246.

Now, if this defines this holy sacrament, it must also define what it was at the time of its institution by our Blessed Lord himself. And then, speaking of what took place on that occasion, we ought to say and believe that Christ offered up himself before he offered himself; that he sacrificed (immolated) himself, all the while being alive; and, moreover, while alive, in that sacrifice, ate himself! For Cardinal Bellarmine (De Missa, lib. i. c. 2,) plainly states—"In a true sacrifice it is requisite that which is offered unto God be destroyed."—(Vid. Bp. Beveridge, Art. xxxi.)

And next, from the wording of the doctrine thus defined by the Church of Rome, let us proceed to compare the doctrine as thus intended to be set forth, with the unequivocal teaching of the word of God upon the subject which is thus daringly handled:—

The Tridentine doctrine is—"that having celebrated the ancient Passover, which the multitude of the children of Israel immolated in memory of their departure out of Egypt, He (Christ) instituted the new Passover, to wit, namely, that Himself should be immolated through the priests." (Vide Trident. Coun. supra.) By which one thing only can be intended to be stated, namely, that as the children of Israel "slew, immolated, destroyed" the lamb in the Passover, so, in like manner, is Christ (the host, or victim) slain, immolated, and destroyed, by the officiating priest, every time the sacrifice of the mass is offered! The doctrine, as stated in the words of the Trent Catechism, Creed, and Canons of the Council, cannot, I think, bear any other construction;

and, if that construction be not nonsense, it appears to me to be very like blasphemy.

This same decree of the Tridentine Council on "the sacrifice of the mass," asserts, that in the host "Christ himself is immolated, under visible signs, by the priests," which, if it does not deny that our Blessed Lord was "the priest" as well as the victim, when he shed his precious blood, once for all, on Calvary, asserts that the officiating priest is Christ; for it states (Catech. p. 246-7), that "the priest is one and the same" (who offers up the host) as Christ our Lord, "who offered up himself". If this be not nonsense, I fear it is blasphemy; and yet the priest who says that in the eucharist he has made Christ his God by transubstantiation, must also affirm, as his Church teaches him, that when he offers the mass he (the priest) sacrifices him again! But Christ, is not only our only victim for the forgiveness of sins, but he is also our only High Priest "for ever according to the order of Melchisedech," capable of offering that victim. Will any one dare to say that in any sense he offers Him in sacrifice? Do the Romish priests, indeed, desire to "crucify the Son of man afresh?"

But even this, shocking as it appears, is not the most fearful of the consequences to which the Tridentine Church is committed by its canons, creed, and catechism, already rehearsed, on the doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass.

That doctrine is, that every time the mass is celebrated, a fresh propitiatory sacrifice "for the remission of sins" is offered; that "it is a perpetual sacrifice, by which our sins may be expiated" (Catec. Pius V., p. 244), "by which the bloody sacrifice once offered on the cross may be renewed."—Ibid. In short, that every time the mass is offered, Christ is offered also "for the remission of sins!"

How thoroughly subversive this is of the doctrine of the Cross, and how totally it is contradicted, in consequence, by the plain and repeated statements of the Word of God, we need scarcely point out to those who have free access to that standard of truth.

The Word of God teaches that CHRIST suffered "once," "only once."—(Heb. ix. 12). "Christ being come a High Priest of good things, not by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, He entered in once (εφαγε, once for all and for ever) into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us (αιωνιαν τρωσιν) a propitiatory offering for ever and ever!"

Again, the Word of God states (Ibid v. 25, 26), "nor yet that He should OFFER HIMSELF OFTEN (οὐδὲ πολλάκις) not more than once; not again and again, as in the mass), for then must He often have suffered: but now once (ἅπαξ, once for all) in the end of the world hath He appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself!"

Again, it is clearly stated, by the same unerring authority, as if the prophetic mind foresaw the future heresy of Rome (Ibid ch. x. 11, 12, 14)—"Every high priest standeth daily ministering, and offering oftentimes the same sacrifice, which can never take away sins; BUT this Man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God!" Every one must perceive the direct denial which these declarations of God's Word receive from the Tridentine dogmas. The Tridentine dogma is, that "the sacrifice of Christ on the Cross is daily renewed in the mass, for the remission of sins of the living and the dead." The Word of God says—"Now, where remission of sin is, there is no more offering for sin." Now, in the mass there is "an offering for sin" made again and again continually; therefore, the offering for sin upon the cross was imperfect and insufficient!"

I challenge the Church of Rome to prove, first, that the doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass, as stated above, is not the authoritative teaching of that community; and, secondly, as compared with the Word of God, that it is not what it was asserted 300 years ago to be, a "blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit."—Art. of Ch. of Eng. xxxi.

4. And now, before I dismiss this subject, it will be a relief and satisfaction every way to the reader, to know what the teaching of the true Catholic Church, regarding the great mystery of the Eucharist, is. It is thus stated by one of her confessors and martyrs, Bishop Ridley, who was burned alive at Oxford, on the 16th October, 1555, in these words—"The controversie, no doubt, which at this day troubleth the Church, is not whether the holy sacrament of the body and blood of Christ is no better than a peice of common bread or no; or whether the Lord's table is no more to be regarded than the table of any earthly man, or no; or whether it be a bare sign or figure of Christ and nothing else, or no; for all do graunt that St. Paule's words do require

* "Whosoever shall seek any other sacrifice propitiatory for sinne maketh the sacrifice of Christ of no validtie, force, or efficacie. For if it bee sufficient to remit sinnes, what need is there of any other? For the necessite of another argueth and declareth this to be insufficient. Almighty God, grant that we may truly leane on this one sacrifice of Christ; and that we to himmay again repay our sacrifice of thanksgiving, or praise, of confessing of His name, of true amendment, or repenteance, or mercifulnes towards our neighbours, and of all other good words of charitie! For by such sacrifices we shall declare ourselves neither ungrateful to God, nor altogether unworthy of this holy sacrifice of Christ."—Archbishop Crammer's Explication, given at Oxford before he suffered.